

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,750		11/12/2003	Yong Soon Park	CU-3448 WWP	7552
26530	7590	09/14/2004		· EXAMINER	
LADAS	& PARI	RY LLP	PEDDER, DENNIS H		
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1200				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60604			3612		
				DATE MAILED: 09/14/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	LA III AL AL						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
0.00 - 4.41 - 0	10/706,750	PARK, YONG SOON					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Dennis H. Pedder	3612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period variety of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 November 2003</u> is/a							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. Is have been received in Applicati Irity documents have been receive In (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D						
Notice of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)					
S. Patent and Trademark Office							

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are clearly literally translated and must be put into proper format for U.S. patent practice. The claims are replete with terms lacking clear antecedent as "the side surface of the upper and lower surface of the unfolded divided panel", alternative structure as "two or more" and "extending the front and rear....or partitioning", incorrect statements as "telescopically", and vague phrases as "such as", claim 2. The responsibility for correction of these types of defects rests with applicant and representative.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the details of claims 3-4 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

Application/Control Number: 10/706,750 Page 3

Art Unit: 3612

should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: claims 3 and 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Amann or Jurgensen in view of Wannert.

Applicant admits in figure 1 that cylinder-shaped connection rods for a hinged panel are prior art. Use of same for an upwardly opening panel is common knowledge in this art, obvious to use here to reduce effort of lifting as evidenced by the cylinders of Jurgensen. Both Amann and Jurgensen lack only the claimed hinged connection of the side panels to the upper surface of the floor panel, using instead hinged connection to the side wall wherein the side panel is not required to be lifted into position. However, Wannert taught before the invention of applicant, that if desired the side panel could be hinged to the hinged floor panel. As a result: It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide in either Amann or Jurgensen a side panel hinged to the floor panel as taught by Wannert in order to relieve hinge strain on the side wall.

- 7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Amann or Jurgensen in view of Wannert as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Martin.
 - It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide in the references above a roller with attached shield as taught by Martin in order to reduce the weight of the assembly by removing the outer wall extension panel.
- 8. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Amann or Jurgensen in view of Wannert, optionally in view of Martin, as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Owen.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide in the references above water taps connected to a supply by hose as taught by Owen in order to wash hands.

Disposition of a water tank at ceiling is deemed to be an obvious expedient to insure gravity feed.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,750 Page 5

Art Unit: 3612

9. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Amann or Jurgensen in view of Wannert, optionally in view of Martin, as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Owen and Coon, Jr..

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide in the references above a folding sink as taught by Martin in order to maximize space within the vehicle and located within a panel with insertion hole as taught by Coon, Jr. in order to provide support and location for soap, for example.

10. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Amann or Jurgensen in view of Wannert, optionally in view of Martin, as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Tarver.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide in the references above a partition to separate a lavatory area as taught by Tarver for privacy and odor control. A portable potty or "septic tank" is common knowledge in this art obvious to use here to reduce weight and ease emptying.

11. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either

Amann or Jurgensen in view of Wannert, optionally in view of Martin, as applied to claims 1 and

2 above, and further in view of Ruck et al..

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide in either set of references above a hinged panel at the separation of drivers and cargo space in order to allow reclining of the driver's seat as taught by Ruck et al.. Whether the seat contacts the hinged panel is an obvious choice of the driver and certainly not a patentable distinction.

Art Unit: 3612

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Carlson shows connection of seat and back panel. Sicklesteel shows a connection rod.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis H. Pedder whose telephone number is (703) 308-2178. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30-2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn D. Dayoan can be reached on (703) 308-3102. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

> Dennis H. Pedder **Primary Examiner**

> > 9/8/64

Art Unit 3612

DHP 9/8/2004